

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Office of the Director
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8591
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

Tuesday, February 23, 2016
77 N. Front Street, STAT Room (Lower Level)

Planning Division
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)
Urban Design Manager
(614) 645-8404
djthomas@columbus.gov

I. Attendance

Present: Otto Beatty, Jr. (Vice-Chair); Michael Brown; Tedd Hardesty; Kyle Katz, Robert Loversidge; Mike Lusk; Jana Maniace

Absent: Danni Palmore, Steve Wittmann

City Staff: Daniel Thomas, Dan McCann, Kelly S, Ashley Senn, Brad Hayes

II. Approval of the January 26, 2016 Downtown Commission Meeting Results

Motion to approve (7-0)

III. Old Business

Case #1 16-2-1

32:00

Address: 85-111 North High Street

Applicant and Property Owner: 85 North High Street LLC c/o Eclipse Real Estate
Design Professional : Kephart – Community • Planning • Architecture (Denver)

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for a mixed use project comprised of apartments (4 levels), ground floor retail fronting High Street and structured parking (3 levels). CC3359.05(C)1) Issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Permit Set for the bulk of the southern (excluding the northernmost portion) expanse of the project.

Specifically today:

- Clarification on details as specified in the attached Results.

In addition,

- Conceptual review of northernmost portion of the project at the corner of High Street and Long Street.

This project was conceptually reviewed by the Commission in July of 2015 and reviewed for Certificate of Appropriateness (15-9-1) in November 2015.

Discussion

Tom Marano – A Foundation Start Permit has already been issued. Enlarged elevation showing details were shown and run through. Sample materials were also shown.

Presentation of the north end was made on a conceptual basis. The building will be clad in a dark panel with lap seams. There will be dark vinyl windows. Materials for this portion were not available. MB – the appearance of the material in the different

renderings were each a little different. Conceptually it looks good, maybe the windows look a little small, especially facing High. Suggestion was made to combine smaller windows into doubles. RL – you’re making a dramatic statement at the other (south) end of the block., but this end is not as dramatic. MB – the other end is “capped”, this end isn’t. A – this is more monolithic and modern. RL – contemporary is okay. Is the garage side all garage, are there any pedestrian openings? A – retail back to a point. TH – some concern with the unarticulated expanse of the Long Street façade. A – the bus stop will be there and interrupt this. ML – signage on High is shown on glass – good to show at this phase, but might be hard to execute. How does it work? A – purely conceptual at this point. Jeff Edwards – to clarify – the bronze panel is anticipated to be just that – bronze. Will have natural patina. Copper was also explored. KK – motion for approval of all except the northern portion. Will bring back details of this section.

Results

Motion to approve issuance of Permit Set for all except the northernmost portion of the project (7-0). This portion was conceptual and will be brought back for final approval review at a future date.

Case #2 16-2-2

54:35

Address: 261 S. Front Street

Matan Project

Applicant & Property Owner: 261 Front, Ltd. (Lifestyle Communities)

Architect: Niles Bolton Associates (Atlanta)

Details (Conditions) Requested by the Downtown Commission for New Construction

At their December 15, 2015 meeting, the Downtown Commission conditionally approved this project (15-12-2) – for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a five story mixed use project comprised of apartments (4 floors), ground floor retail at the corner of Front and Main and two levels of structured parking.

Discussion

Chase Miller – Lifestyle Communities – coming back for details of three specific items. Egress path from the new building adjacent to the old Main St. building. Red brick pavers uses elsewhere in the area, will also be used here. Details of Cherry Street façade. Sconce lighting and also screens and planters. Looking at windows, primarily of the building part at the corner of Main and Front. SDL (Simulated Divided Light) windows will be used, in bronze color.

Results

Motion to accept. Approval of details (7-0)

Case #3 16-1-9

1:00:05

Address: 150 South High Street

deNOVO bistro (at

HighPoint)

Applicant: deNOVO bistro

Property Owner: Kelley Companies

Attorney: Steve Miller, Crabbe Brown & James, LLP

Design: Lisa Snyder, Neighborhood Design Center (Sidewalk café and sketch elevation)

Keiser Design Group (KDG) (Exterior elevations)

Thomas Bol Automation (Front canopy and sidewalk café roofing and support details)

deNOVO bistro (Front door details, preliminary floor plans, alternative elevation sketches, graphics)

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for the storefront and sidewalk café. CC3359.05(C)1)

deNOVO bistro's application was tabled from last month pending more detailed information.

Discussion

Staff presentation of components of approval – from building “skin” elements (windows, mullions, doors) to things with in the R.O.W. (sidewalk café, canopy, café roof). Yavonne Saber – mullions will be black. The windows in the back facing the Commons will be roll up. The awnings on the High Street side will be made of structural metal. Commission still had some issues with the nature of the awning. The awning will have slatted roof. TH – talked about the Streetscape Standard and how far cafes are allowed to come out. 6 feet of clear zone is shown between the clear zone and café fence. YS – aware and have been working with this. The further the fence comes out is 8 ft. OB – this would all have to be cleared with Public Service. YS – the columns are not that intrusive. Thomas Bol – presented on structure of awning. The only portion that is totally covered is the metal canopy. RL – move approval, KK – 2nd.

Results

Motion to approve. (7-0)

Case #4 16-1-10

1:14:30

Address: 132 South High Street

Condado (at HighPoint)

Applicant: Joe Kahn - Condado

Property Owner: Kelley Companies

Design Professionals : David Kerr (Architect)
DaNite (Signage)

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for storefront, signage and patio. CC3359.05(C)1)

The Downtown Commission tabled this application last month pending more detailed information.

Discussion

Looking for approval of the storefronts, patio, graphics. Description, reiteration from last month. Curtain glass walls, black anodized framing. White vinyl graphic applique on windows. 50'(long) x 20'(wide) patio. Patio will be surrounded by yews, as the side of HighPoint has now. OB – logos look different from Jan submission. DJT – photographs are of the Condado's in the University District. OB – smaller window coverage looks better. JK – we could scale it down, I thought they were the same size. MB – the building is already boring and you are bringing life to it. ML – I would make it smaller. A - Patio will be slab on grade concrete, there will be retaining wall, screened with yews. Brick piers to match brick on the existing building, painted steel rails between the piers. Motif – celebration of the Mexican Day of the Dead. Steel skeleton finials. Poles to string lights on the north side. This will be an upgrade from campus location. MB – any thought to a stone facing of the retaining wall? A – we looked at options – there is no pedestrian walkway here between buildings. RL – is there a need for fence or barrier? A – there isn't anything currently. The land is owned by CDDC. Staff had talked to CDDC Staff. TH – concerned about the look of the retaining wall, suggests doubling up the amount of yews. From 5 ft. apart to something more like 3 or 2-6. Concern about the finish of the retaining wall. Needs to

be a smooth face – an architectural finish. On north elevation there will be brick fill with murals, in addition to access doors. Only the recessed parts will be painted. KK – move to accept with third of the glass in vinyl, architectural concrete finish of retaining wall and doubling of yews. RL – 2nd.

Results

Approved with conditions: third of the glass in vinyl, architectural concrete finish of retaining wall and doubling of yews. (7-0)

V.New Business Request for Certificate of Appropriateness

Case# 5 16-2-3

1:30:30

Address: 303-323 E Town Street

Applicant: Todd Sloan, The Daimler Group

Property Owner: 303 Town LLC / Ohio Health Corporation

Architects: Trinity Design Group

Request CC3359.07 (D); CC3359.23

Certificate of Appropriateness for Grant Bone and Joint Expansion Project

Would necessitate the demolition of an existing building.

Discussion

Todd Sloan – Daimler – has been working with Ohio Health for a number of years., including the adjacent Grant Bone and Joint Clinic. The Eye Center at 303 E. Main moved out to the Arena District about 10 years ago. Site orientation given. New building will reflect the Grant Hospital rotunda to establish a gateway. The existing building is only a single story, which sits above parking is obsolete for medical use. Materials (brick, glass, aluminum, etc.) will match those of the medical campus. The back side will be EIFS, because of the closeness to the rear lot line (in terms of constructability). Green area in front shown. Access into the new facility – the existing canopy at the current B&J Clinic will be extended as will queuing. One-stop –shop meeting has already occurred. Access point will align with 6th St. JM – expressed concern about vehicles finding the right direction. A – signage / wayfaring for the Grant campus will be extended. The center curb cut is exit only. The back portion is trash truck accessible. The buildings will be connected with a 10 ft. wide corridor. Schedule – approval from the Ohio Health Board; would like to start demolition in May and start construction in June. Request that enough approvals can be given to allow construction to proceed. Will come back for landscaping and signage. Would like to get today – approval of site plan (no landscaping), building elevations, and building footprint so we could move forward finalizing those plans. RL – move approval, KK – 2nd.

Results

Motion to approve site plan (no landscaping), building elevations, and building footprint. (6-1-0)
Hardesty abstaining

Case #6 16-2-4

1:48:22

Address: 457 & 459 N. High Street

Applicant: Zach Price

Property Owner: 459 High Street Development, LLC

Architects: TRIAD Architects, Ltd.

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation of two building within the North Market Historic District. CC3359.05(C)1)

The project was reviewed by the Historic Resources Commission (HRC) in January, which authorized the Historic Preservation Office staff to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA). For major projects, such as this, CoA's from both the HRC and Downtown Commission are required.

Discussion

These two buildings were part of the Yankee Trader. Adjacent buildings to the north have been redeveloped by applicant a few years ago. Project is largely restoration and reuse. Already has HRC approval and are working out some minor details subject to HRC staff submission. Federal and State Historic Tax Credits. Prism glass and transom are original and will be restored. Buildings have been connected internally. HRC issues are mostly with paint colors and some specific materials involving string course. RL – I think it's great that these buildings are getting done. Move approval pending submission of HRC items also to Downtown Commission staff.

Dan McCann, from City Code Enforcement, said that there were complaints about condition and appearance of these buildings and that the applicant has been cooperative. Code Enforcement is pleased with move to restore.

Results

Approved – submit HRC revision resubmittal to Downtown Commission staff. (7-0)

Case#7 16-2-5**1:54:00**

Location: Convention Center, including Parking Facilities

Applicant: Schooley Caldwell Associates / LMN Architects / MKSK

Property Owner: Franklin County Convention Facilities Authority

Design Professionals: Schooley Caldwell Associates / LMN Architects / MKSK

Request CC3359.07 (A)

- A. Certificate of Appropriateness for new hardscape, landscape, lighting and signage at the convention center. Deviation from Downtown Streetscape Standards.
- B. Conceptual review to the west side of Convention Center Way.

Discussion

Robert Loversidge recusing. Steve Munger – last here, a year ago February, for expansion to the north and for the bridge connection. Brian Kinzelman (MKSK) – OB – the new garage looks great at night. BK – there are tight constraints on the north side (Goodale). Buffed washed concrete, plus some special highlights – (non-standard) – adding color. Some aggregate added. Tonal differentiation. Also pavers and granite. Desire to showcase this building. Major new entry lobby at the northwest corner – very open. Attempt to enliven the ground plain, which heretofore had been boring. Tree grates with pavers over the top, still providing sufficient roots. Other trees will have green tree lawn. Series of architectural precast benches, some wood slats for comfort. Plant material – honey locust along High St., Gingkoes on Goodale. Stainless steel bollards, trash receptacles as used elsewhere. Street lighting – taller Esplanade fixture on both sides of High St. Accent up lighting that are submerged.

MB – lots of changes since last time – water feature and public art. BK – art has been located, although not selected. At this time it is going to be one piece. If there are changes, we'll come back. Fountain piece went the way of budget constraints. The water was a "skim" over cut granite pavers. A little ground cover over the south end of this area will be used. This is supposed to be an active area. MB - concerns about heat in summer and boring nature. Goodale and High is a "primo" location and is deserving of attention. Just one unresponsive piece of art might not be effective.

BK - West side of High is not part of this project per se, but is also being developed for new streetscape treatment – Public Service Dept. has a separate contract.

BK - There will be up lighting of the existing façade. These portions of the facade will be absent of street trees and will have different pavement. Description of entrance area with benches and trees and of "Arnold" area / courtyard. Nonstandard elements of pavers and lights have all been conditionally approved by Public Service contingent upon the Commission's acceptance. Raised curbs for street trees is granite, street curb is concrete. Precast concrete seating. We are coordinating both sides of the street, but coming for approval of only the east (Convention Center) side. The double headed post top lights will be used on the west, but not on the east. These lower lights on this side would be in competition with the special lighting of plaza trees and facades.

BK - Sidewalk area is wide including that in the R.O.W. and Convention Center owned. Plantings and benches are designed to create some separation between road and pedestrian travel way. (for comfort and safety). Planting area will decrease area for runoff. Benches will be architectural precast. Simplicity of these was purposeful so as to not compete with the architecture.

SM – described signage. Desire is for clarity of information, branding and visibility. Various locations were shown. Directional signage and signage for parking, including numbers of spaces left. Many signs already exist in their current locations, but will be updated. MB asked about airport shuttle stop and need for coordination with COTA. Entrances to the convention center will be specially illuminated and articulated. The south entrance will have especially large emphatic graphics, in part because Nationwide Blvd. is a little distant.

Conceptual Review – Convention Center Drive west turnaround is affected by being over the railroad tracks. Engineering studies are being done with the bridge. OB – what is being proposed is a big improvement. BK – Perforated screening over jersey barriers, LED lighting. Final design will be dependent on the loading design of the existing or new bridge / deck. MB – it's impossible not to improve this area. This is an opportunity for bold, big colorful. Right now all I'm seeing is landscaping. What do visitors see when they are arriving, where they are arriving? Only one piece of public art in a third of a mile. Not enough. TH – overall landscape treatment is fantastic. In regards to the Streetscape Standards, this is a perfect example of when and why we would like to divert. A special institution with very unique architecture. JM – I agree, it's a beautiful execution of the site. Treatment of black granite at corner in lieu of water element is important. Staff mentioned that a number of the signs on Vine Street are in the North Market Historic District and will also need the approval of the HRC. The proposal today represents about \$8 million of a larger \$102 million project, much of which is the interior. ML – motion to approve, TH – 2nd.

Results

- Approval of larger streetscape project (hardscape, landscape, lighting and signage) – (5-1-0) Loversidge recusing.
- Conceptual review of West portion of Convention Center Way

Case #8 16-2-6**Locations:** A. 141 N. Fourth St. B. 226 S. Front St.**Applicant:** Lucas J. Harris, LT Harris LLC**Property Owners:** A. General Tire Sales LLC ; B. Bicentennial Plaza Holding Co. Ltd.**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a freestanding Automatic Teller Machine (ATM) on surface parking lot. CC3359.05(C)1)

Postponed per request of applicant.

Case #9 16-2-7

2:39:00

Location: Washington Ave. & Engler St.**Addresses:** E. Engle St. – 521, 523, 525, 527 & 529; S. Washington Ave. - 390, 394, 396 & 398**Applicant and Property Owner:** Ronk Brothers Properties, Ltd.**Architects(Parking Lot Designer):** James Monsul, Architect**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of former row house complex and construction of surface parking. CC3359.05(C)1) CC3359.23

Discussion

WR- Property has been rented to Children's Hospital, but there is a need for parking, brought on by the construction of the construction of the Mound Street I-70 off ramp. OB – there seems to be two different plans (35-7 and the other 50-7). A – one of the plans is with the building still standing – that parks 37; with the building down, I can pick up 20 more (to 57). I did gain some when the church came down. About 250 people need to park at the property. RL – there are two different plans showing the row houses down (both marked 50-7). OB – one has the cars backing out into Engler The other one doesn't have them backing into Engler. A – no one uses the alley except those who are going to Children's Hospital. RL – all of these plans show parking pavement beyond the property line. A - we would have to get a variance for that. RL – from whom ODOT or the City. A – I intend to from the City, but haven't yet. MB – is the row house empty? I currently have three people in them, one of them is month to month. I bought the property with the intent of making more parking.

RL – the Commission doesn't support the demolition of historic buildings for the construction of surface parking. Guidelines indicate that to demolish you have to show that what will replace the building is better than what you are removing. We've never defined surface parking as being better than a building. I have a big problem taking this building down. There are still two or three buildings of this scale in this neighborhood. This is like a bookend; it is almost the last one. OB – Is this an historic building? RL – Sure it is. It's not a landmark building, it is indicative of what an entire part of the city used to be. ML – this part of downtown has a lot of potential, I would hate to see this building come down. MB – with the demand for housing, have you floated this by anyone? Redevelopment? A – No. JM – do the parking plans optimize what could be gained? AS – the State agreed to allow the use of some of the land. JM – could you keep the building and still maximize the amount of parking. A – it would be hard. This is the most parking we could possibly get. MB – what is the ownership and does it extend. TH – we talked about a similar demolition request a couple of months ago. This is a contributing building on its own. If somebody came up with a more comprehensive look, including multiple properties, maybe

consideration would be different. But as it is, I don't feel comfortable with demolition. OB – what is the pleasure of the group, table this? Did we table that application? Staff – believe that it was firmly tabled and never returned. (15-6-5, 327 S. Washington Ave. – *TABLED*). ML – the only reason to table would be if the applicant would come back with the agreement to park in the R.O.W. area that would be a reason to come back. A – the owner at the time made agreement with the State of Ohio. ML – I also don't see any property lines so we don't know what we are dealing with. OB – votes aren't here to approve so do we table or not?

TH – What sort of City approval is necessary beyond the State's? RL – I'm confused about what the State has done. What makes us think that the State will allow this parking within their R.O.W.? A – I have it writing, when the Engler property was sold to me, these rights transferred. OB – the issue, in summary, is whether we will grant him permission to demolish in order to gain 20 parking spaces. RL – I'm not convinced that a better / bigger parking lot is appropriate compared to the existing building., I won't vote for it. ML – I can't support the demolition either, it comes down to whether the parking plan 35-7 is acceptable to us. I don't think we have enough information. Table it, have staff work with the applicant to come up with the information. I need to see property lines, see some evidence that the State is acceptable to the encroachment to their easement, any existing or proposed plan, there is a lot of information missing. ML – move to table if the applicant wants to come back with that information.

ML - I don't think that the Commission is going to support demolition of the building for the future use of a parking lot. OB – We're trying to work with you, maybe you would be better off having us table, you just don't have the votes here.

Results

Tabled – show agreement (contract) with ODOT allowing use of R.O.W., explore greater yield of parking spaces and more information as articulated above. (6-0) Katz left meeting.

VI. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for Advertising Murals

Case #10 16-1-11M

2:57:35

Hollywood Casino Ad Mural

55 E. Spring Street

Applicant: Outfront Media

Property Owner: Stickmen Properties Ltd. c/o Richard T. Day

Design Professional: Outfront Media

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of vinyl mesh advertising murals to be located on the north elevation at 55 E. Spring St. Proposed mural – Hollywood Casino. The Downtown Commission has previously approved numerous murals at this location, the latest being for another Hollywood Casino. CC3359.07(D)

The Downtown Commission tabled last month's application pending more detailed information.

Dimensions of mural: left and right 116' W x 28' H, Two dimensional, lit

Term of installation: Seeking approval from February 24 through December 31, 2016

Area of mural: 3248 sf

Approximate % of area that is text: 1.3%

Discussion

The proposed light bars will not go over any of the windows. TH – asked the applicant to describe the vertical LED cabinets. A – 24 inches wide. A – this could be cut down. MB – I don't know why the Commission would have an interest in making this more of a billboard. A – we tried to encourage the client to making it more interesting with three dimensionality. MB – the existing one has more animation – I don't understand why the need for the light boxes. We like artistic murals. ML – you're trying to show a film reel. And you are using those lights to separate the images. Your reel stripes at the top and bottom would not be noticed. A – there would be cross lighting at the bottom. MB – I've never seen ad mural fixtures come down. TH – the mural is supposed to up until the end of the year? A – right. TH – these are images with very little text. Professional photography. I am bothered by the LED cabinets. Maybe the strips at the bottom and top separate the three panels. A – the cabinets weren't even discussed last time. What can we do today to move this forward? A2 – what if the light strips go away? JM – I think it's fine without any lighting. If there were a lighting element, it should be more subtle. RL – suggest the sprocket holes be enlarged for effect. Double or triple the size so we can see them. A – also halo light from beneath. MB – motion to accept with a larger film strip top and bottom, glow lights and no light bars. A – agreeable. RL – 2nd.

Results

Approved pending that applicant resubmit per the following conditions 1) movie sprockets to be enlarged, 2) lighting at bottom (vertical lights to be removed). (6-0)

Case #11 16-2-8M

3:10:00

Lake Erie ad mural

Address: 110 N. Third Street

Applicant: Orange Barrel Media

Property Owner: Exchange Urban Lofts Condominium Association

Design Professional: Orange Barrel Media

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the north elevation of 110 N. Third Street. Proposed mural – Lake Erie Love There have been numerous murals at this location, currently Columbia (Sports Wear). CC3359.05(C)1)

Identical mural was up at this location last year.

Dimensions of mural: 26'W x 76'H, lit

Term of installation: Seeking approval from March 31 through July 2, 2016

Area of mural: 1,976 sf

Approximate % of area that is text: 3%

Discussion

This will reuse the same ad mural that was used last year. RL – move to approve, OB – 2nd.

Results

Motion to approve. (5-1) Loversidge no

Case #12 16-2-9M**3:11:00****Maker's Mark ad mural****106 N. High Street****Applicant:** Orange Barrel Media**Property Owner:** 106 North High Street LLC (The Atrium Lofts)**Design Professional:** Orange Barrel Media**Request:**

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the north elevation at 106 N. High Street. Proposed mural – Maker's Mark – "Welcome to Deliciousville. Pop 3. ". The Downtown Commission has previously approved numerous murals at this location, the latest for the Major League Soccer Cup. CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: 45'3"W x 90'6"H Two dimensional, non lit**Term of installation:** Seeking approval from March 31 through June 30, 2016**Area of mural:** 4,095 sf**Approximate % of area that is text:** 5%**Discussion**

Partial bottles, logos are downplayed. Pouring emphasis. RL – motion, ML – 2nd.

Results

Motion to approve. (6-0)

Case #13 16-2-10M**Maker's Mark Ad Mural****274 S. Third Street****Applicant:** Orange Barrel**Property Owner:** Devere LLC**Design Professional:** Orange Barrel**Request:**

Design review and approval for installation of vinyl mesh advertising murals to be located on the north elevation at 274 S. Third St. Proposed mural – Maker's Mark - "Welcome to Deliciousville. Pop. 3". The Downtown Commission has previously approved numerous murals at this location, the latest being for St. Jude Children's . CC3359.07(D)

Dimensions of mural: 30'W x 22'H Two dimensional, non lit**Term of installation:** Seeking approval from March 31 through June 30, 2016**Area of mural:** 660 sf**Approximate % of area that is text:** 5%**Results**

Motion to approve. (6-0)

Case #14 16-2-11M**3:12:30****Maker's Mark Art ad mural****Address:** 260 S. Fourth Street**Applicant:** Orange Barrel Media

Property Owner: Stoddart Block LP

Design Professional: Orange Barrel Media

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the south elevation of 260 S. Fourth St. Proposed mural – Maker’s Mark– “Columbus does bridges. We do delicious.” There have been numerous ad murals at this location, the current being for the Columbus Museum of Art CC3359.07(D)

Dimensions of mural: 113’W x 31’-6”H, non lit vinyl mesh banner

Term of installation: Seeking approval from March 31 through June 31, 2016

Area of mural: 3,559.5 sf

Approximate % of area that is text: 7%

Discussion

Play on bridges. There will be an extension beyond the building. Maker’s Mark is trying to bring some type of local relevance. The applicant has agreed to limit text to 5%.

Results

Approved upon condition that applicant resubmits as per reduction of text to 5%. (6-0)

VII. Business / Discussion

Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last meeting (September 22, 2015)

1. 285 N Front St. – Apple ad mural
2. 43 W. Long St.
3. 60 E. Long St.
4. 35 W. Spring St.
5. 15 W. Cherry St.
6. 300 Spruce St. – Sign
7. 195 E. Main St. – temporary fence
8. 260 S. Fourth St. – blade sign for Hadley’s
9. 220 E. Main St. – Lev’s apartments – interior work
10. 90 W. Broad St. – City Hall - refurbish doors – mostly for interior security setup
11. 37 N. Third St. – refurbish exterior
12. 20 E. Gay St. – Storefront for Mile on High appl.

If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 645-8404.

3:14:30